HAL VERB
P.O. BOX 421815
S.F., CA. 94142-1815

SEPT. 20, 1997

HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal:

The past three weeks have been pretty hectic for me and, as you'll see, quite a learning experience.

On August 30th I appeared on a "cable-access" television show speaking on the JFK case. The other guests were Jim DiEugenio (a very partisan Garrison believer) and a Dr. David Stern. Stern helps assist DiEugenio on his magazine "Probe". (I've enclosed a xerox of the latest issue of "Probe" for your use). Stern was discussing the medical evidence and I tried to get into the issue of the ARRB and how badly they've handled the case. At the beginning I noted how both defenders of the Warren Commission & its detractors have mishandled the first day evidence in the form of the assassination sequence. I told the potential viewers (all this was done to be aired at a later date) that I had a list of 25 writers in the assassination who described the first shot. I pointed out 16 of these and said none agreed with each other on just the first shot and were hopelessly muddled when coming to any agreement as to the timing and number of other shots.

I mentioned your work and I hope that when people do get to view it they will hopefully act on acquiring at least one of your books.

I should note that this "cable-access" TV station is a college run one and the college is in the Sacramento area. (It took about an hour and one-half to get to the TV studio). Originally we were to do 4 hours but because of the usual screw-ups our programming was cut to only 2 hours but that was enough to get in my attack on the ARRB. I should get a copy of the video soon & will let you know how it all came out after it is edited.

That was the first of my experiences which, while useful, was only the beginning of my "learning experience." A few days before Wednesday, Sept. 10th I received a call from KSFO radio in S.F. One of the talk show hosts (Jeoff Medcalf) wanted both myself and Dr. Cary Aguilar to appear on his show. Medcalf has a 5 day morning show that runs from 9:30 am to 12 noon. Medcalf wanted the two of us to appear (live) from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m.

At first I didn't want to go on (KSFO is notoriously right wing. ABC (through KGO) bought them out and its format is thoroughly right-wing. As an example they have a talk show host, Michael Savage, whose hour is called "Savage Nation". (A friend who listens to it — not a right winger — told me while Savage is Jewish he has stated that he can't understand how Jews can be liberal! Another talk show host is the son of Ronald Reagan & equally bad. The "token" black talk show host is called the "Black Avenger" and is critical of everything progressive blacks stand for. By the way KSFO is the station Jim Eason moved to when he left KGO & you know how Eason has turned.

As I indicated previously I didn't want to appear on the KSFO radio program but my friend, Julian Lagos, (who helped produce my 14 hour tv series on the assassinations which I did in 1994+1995 almost twisted my arm to do the show + I relented + went on. Aguilar told KSFO that he wouldn't be able to appear as he had surgery that day but he managed to call in anyway + took considerable time discussing his viewing the autopsy photos and X-rays after being granted permission by the JFK family. He brought up the argument of 44 persons who described the back of the head removed while the photos somehow show this not to be the case. Gary avoided outright stating the autopsy evidence being "faked" but he asked how could 44 persons state what they did and "all" be wrong?

I did my best to raise the question of the ARRB performance to date and really attacked that performance. At one point I mentioned to Medcalf that my radio appearance was the first time I knew of anywhere that the ARRB was discussed from a critical point of view. I studied Medcalf's bodily reaction and it was as if he were saying "I'd really rather be fishing, now!"

I should tell you that a salesman from the company I work with happened to hear me on the radio (he was surprised, too, for he never knew about my JFK work) and I asked him what he thought of the program. His comment to me—and this I laughed out loud when he

said it — was: "He (Medcalf) was" eminently forgettable" and that I sounded "authoritative".

Medcalf told my friend, Julian, the ex-producer of my 14 TV shows, who was in the studio with me when I was on KSFO that he "didn't like me". I told Julian it was probably because he couldn't toss poison ~~darts~~ darts & wound me the way ~~he can~~ he would've liked to. (Julian told me that since he's listened to KSFO that Medcalf used to be in Military Intelligence, worked for Special Forces and did "black bag" jobs for them). It's my understanding that this would possibly include murder. Another friend told me he was not a Vietnam veteran so this gives you a pretty good idea of the kind of people KSFO "employs"!

An interesting note to add to this is that just before I went on the radio the producer of the show (not Medcalf) said to me: "I don't like half the people I work with!"

Talk about "living in the entrails of the monster"!

I vowed to myself that after the Medcalf experience I'll never again go on his show. I also understand that since you were waiting to be called by phone while I was on the air that KSFO did reach you but somehow you got cut off. Is this true — or, at least, that is what Julian told me but I was unable to verify it.

I can tell you this, though. I mentioned your name & your work on the program and at one point when we were discussing a particular point I said you can call Mr. Weisberg & he, Medcalf quickly put me down & said "I don't want to hear what Mr. Weisberg has to say — I want to know what you have to say!" at another point I mentioned Mary Ferrell & said he (Medcalf) could have quite a program just interviewing her & he, again, said: "No, I don't want to hear her — I'm here to hear you!"

You can see what I was up against & friends have been calling me & saying "why did you ever agree to appear on a station like that?" Bill O'Neil whom I'm sure you know of & he's one of the finest researchers I know of called me up & said that he "wanted to throw (his) radio all the way from San Carlos" in Medcalf's face because Medcalf wouldn't let me develop any of my themes.

As I said it was a learning experience and now I can state factually how it is to appear before the "know nothings" of the night — I no longer need "indulge" in intellectualizing about it.

My evening talk (with Aguilar) on Sept. 10th (same days as the radio program) also provided another "learning experience" for me.

When both I and Gary talked the agreement at first was to have me speak first and then Gary

would be second since he was presenting a slide show. Actually the program for the evening was to focus attention solely on the ARRB and its performance but that's not what happened. Gary wanted to go on first since, he said, he needed to leave earlier but he did stay to the end. I like Gary but his slide show was stuck on the medical evidence particularly his claim of "44" who described the back of the (JFK) missing. I wanted him to go into the ARRB & I told him I was going to be very critical of the ARRB. But Gary went over his time limit & I quickly got up & said, "Look, I'm here to solely discuss the ARRB" & then I went into my critical evaluation. Before I knew it I barely got into what I wanted to expand upon & the time was up.

I must say that when Gary was presenting his slides he at one time said there was were no notes showing changes in the autopsy report & I immediately interjected & said, "No, Gary—that's not true—the notes with the substantive changes exist & were published in "Post Mortem". I even mentioned Admiral Galloway's role.

I recall a conversation I had once with David Wrone when he was here in S.F. & I met him & his lovely face & David said he had just met with Aguilar prior to seeing me. Wrone turned to me & said, "You know, Hal, sometimes that Gary scares me!" I told Wrone "I know what you mean!"

I recall that at one point during Gary's slide show he commented on the Oswald backyard photo and said "Oswald was holding a Trotskyist newspaper" and then said Oswald had "no association" with the Trotskyists." I wanted to correct Gary and mention that, of course, the photo showed Oswald holding <u>two</u> newspapers the other one being a Communist one and that Oswald wrote to the SWP offering his help (photographic) and subscribed to the "Militant". (I can now understand better why Wrone gets "scared" by Aguilar's comments).

After the evening talk was over Gary, while he was putting all his things in his brief case turned to me & said "You know <u>too</u> much about this case, Hal." (Is this a complement, I wondered to myself?).

By the way Gary invited a doctor friend to attend the evening talks and when I mentioned during my talk that the ARRB ought to subpoena a Dr. George Loguyram about why he went "off the record" during a discussion of the medical panel of the HSCA. At that meeting of the doctors the discussion focused on the head shot & I pointed to an article I had written that Loguyram may have been referring to a <u>double</u> head shot. I noted in my evening talk that the HSCA report on a certain page mentions the double head shot.

I noted in my evening talk that I had been informed by a reliable researcher (Joe Riley, a neuroanatomist) that Dr. Loquvam wrote the HSCA medical report +, thus, had to be aware of the page in the HSCA report on the double head shot.

The doctor friend of Aguilar came up to me after I gave my talk + said he had been a friend of Loquvam + knew Loquvam when he had a Forensic Institute in Oakland, California. He then told me that Loquvam eventually settled in Oregon and died about two years ago (I've seen no notices in the press about this).

I still think it is possible that the Loquvam family may have papers, letters, etc + they should be reached or, failing that, the other doctors who were present with him when he was at the HSCA discussing the head wound should be reached. Since they all agreed to go "off the record" they must know why they went off. Don't you think?

As if these events weren't enough for my "learning experience" I then faced a personality problem with my friend who helped produced my TV shows (Julian).

I told Julian that I had called another radio station that would be more

receptive to my discussing the ARRB and they were very interested & asked for a bio of myself & what I've done & brief notes on the ARRB. (I'm making one up this week-end to submit to them).

When Julian was told by me what I was doing he said "Well, let's get Bill Turner on with you" and I said, no, Bill has not appeared before the ARRB - hasn't written on the ARRB - and, if he were questioned, would probably say I really can't say much about the ARRB which would be expected since he's not participated. I told Julian, "look I never really had a chance to discuss it when I was on KSFO & the evening talks prevented me - because of time constraints - of going into the issue of the ARRB.

Julian then said I was being "egotistical" and accused me of being one who "knew it all" & I said that was completely false & I said my purpose was to get the info out on what the ARRB was doing (or more precisely not doing). And he did all this scene at my work place which wasn't at all tactful on his part. At an earlier point in time Julian refused to believe me when I invited a free-lance TV video person who asked me if it was OK to do a video & I agreed. Julian actually believed that I wanted to market a video and share the profits with

the video person. I told him—no—I wanted to have a video made so that it could be seen by a larger number of people + not just that Wednesday evening audience (which had, at the most 30 people). To this day I still feel Julian doesn't believe me and it has damaged my relationship with him. It may mean that in the future when videos, or talks are being given I'll have to work with others. It is unfortunate but it may come to that.

I guess that'll give you enough info on what I've been through these past 3 weeks. It certainly hasn't been dull, I'll say that!

Now to get to the enclosures - they all speak for themselves.

One thing I do wish to note. If you'll recall I said that I'd come across the "Oxford Companion to the Supreme Court of the U.S." and that it was edited by Kermit L. Hall. All true, of course, but I thought the entry on Earl Warren in that volume was by Hall (see enclosed) but I was wrong. The entry was written by Melvin Urofsky + not by Hall. But Hall must stand by it. Notice on the entry page (915) that Urofsky states "Warren should have followed his critical instincts to turn the assignment (the Warren Commission) down."

Even though this is Urofsky's thought isn't it fair to say Hall has to stand behind that? What do you think?

Best,
Hal Verb